Indonesia - Green Prosperity - Grant Facility

Report generated on: December 21, 2017

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Indonesia

EVALUATION TITLE
Green Prosperity - Grant Facility

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-IDN-GPF-2017-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
Licensed datasets, accessible under conditions,

Overview

ABSTRACT
The evaluation is designed to assess the design and operations of the GP Facility, which consists of Activities 2-3 of the GP Project. It is a performance evaluation that relies on reviews of project data and documents, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, site visits, and an online survey. This evaluation will serve two primary purposes, based on the results of the Evaluability Assessment. Namely, it will:

· Inform the design of future grant facilities (by MCC) and/or trust fund facilities (by the Indonesian government), based on GPF learnings; and

· Provide accountability surrounding changes and adaptations made throughout the course of the GPF to a variety of MCC, MCA, and partner organization stakeholders

MCC currently implements the grant facility model more than ten Compacts, and is interested in better understanding the GPF results and process in order to help inform whether and how to implement this type of model within other MCC/MCA contexts. Similarly, the Indonesian government is considering whether and how to continue to work towards GP objectives following Compact closure, and aligned with their own country priorities and discussions with additional donors. Initial discussions have included conversations around the possibility of using a trust-fund model or something similar to continue this type of work.

As such, this evaluation is expected to complement existing data surrounding appropriate approaches and models to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Indonesia, and provide key lessons learned for these two audiences.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Other (Performance Evaluation)

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
individuals

KIND OF DATA
Other

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Grants		
Environment		
Greenhouse Gas		
Facility		
Natural Resource Management		

KEYWORDS
Indonesia, Environment, GHG, Emissions, Grant, Facility

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
Indonesia - key informant interviews took place in Jakarta, Bogor, Yogyakarta, Mamuju, Makassar, Jambi, Lombok, Pontianak, Bali.

The survey willl capture all implementation provinces for GP, including Riau, Jambi, West Sumatra, Bengkulu, South Sumatra, West Sulawesi, South Sulawesi, Southeast Sulawesi, Gorontalo, West Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, North Kalimantan, West Nusa Tenggara (NTB), and East Nusa Tenggara (NTT)

Data were sampled purposively, and thus cannot be considered representative at any level.

UNIVERSE
The study population includes all grantees, grant applicants, contractors, MCA-I staff involved in GP, MCC staff involved in GP, GOI representatives invovled in GP, and grant administrators for Green Prosperity.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Social Impact	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata
Social Impact	SI		Drafting of Metadata

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION
2017-12-22

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
Version 1 (2016-10-6): This is the first metadata entry for the GPF evaluation. It has been developed on the basis of the Evaluation Design Report.

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-IDN-GPF-2017-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Indonesia Compact

PROGRAM
In 2011, MCC entered into a $600 million, five-year Compact Agreement with the Republic of Indonesia, reflecting its focus on sustainable economic growth. The Compact Program consists of three projects: The Community-Based Health and Nutrition to Reduce Stunting Project (Nutrition), the Procurement Modernization (PM) Project, and the Green Prosperity (GP) Project. The Compact's largest component, the $332.5 million GP Project, invests in renewable energy and improving land use practices and Natural Resources Management (NRM) as part of the Government's national development strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Much of this investment occurs through the centerpiece GPF, the compact's grant-making and administration body which funds renewable energy and natural resource management programs. The objectives of the GP Project are to increase productivity and reduce reliance on fossil fuels by expanding renewable energy, and to increase productivity and reduce land-based greenhouse gas emissions by improving land use practices and management of natural resources. It consists of four activities: 1) Participatory Land Use Planning, 2) Technical Assistance and Oversight, 3) GP Facility, and 4) Green Knowledge.

MCC SECTOR
Other (Other)

PROGRAM LOGIC
The objectives of the GP Project were to increase productivity and reduce reliance on fossil fuels by expanding renewable energy, and to increase productivity and reduce land-based greenhouse gas emissions by improving land use practices and management of natural resources. It was designed to promote environmentally sustainable, low carbon economic growth consistent with the GOI's development and climate change strategies. Through a combination of technical assistance, grants, and commercial financing, GP sought to help communities improve land management practices and design and implement economic development activities that enhance livelihoods and protect critical ecosystem services. More broadly, GP aimed to help foster greater, greener, and smarter outside investment in Indonesia by improving the basis by which land use decisions are made and creating incentives for increased deployment of cleaner technologies. The GPF was the centerpiece of the GP Project - a funding facility designed to finance investments in commercial scale and community-based renewable energy (less than 10MW), sustainable NRM, and community-based NRM projects to promote sustainable landscapes and land use practices. The Facility was designed to be complemented by the Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) Activity and the Green Knowledge (GK) Activity.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
MCA-I selected grantees through open calls for proposals for each of the windows, all of which had different requirements.The portfolio of grants was fully awarded by July 2017, and is organized into five funding windows: · Window 1 (Partnership Grants): These grants leverage private sector or other outside funding to promote increased investment in sustainable NRM and improved land-use practices in either targeted landscapes or targeted agricultural value chains. All partnership grants required co-funding by the partner on at least a 1:1 basis, with preference given to Partnerships committing a higher share of co-funding. · Window 2 (Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM)): These grants fund smaller-scale, community-based projects that promote enhanced management of watersheds and forests to improve the sustainability of renewable energy (RE) and/or agriculture investments, and support rural livelihoods and economic development that result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions. · Window 3 (RE): These grants fund community-based off-grid (3A) and commercial-scale on-grid (3B) renewable energy projects. · Technical Assistance and Project Preparation (TAPP): These grants fund studies (environmental, social, feasibility) and technical assistance to enhance the quality of the projects under the windowsin Windows 1 and 3. · GK: These grants build local, provincial, and national capacity to drive forward Indonesia's nation-wide low carbon development strategy within the context of the GP Project.

Sampling

Study Population

The study population includes all grantees, grant applicants, contractors, MCA-I staff involved in GP, MCC staff involved in GP, GOI representatives invovled in GP, and grant administrators for Green Prosperity.

Sampling Procedure

The study sample includes 73 KIIs and 3 FGDs (total of 94 respondents) that were sampled purposively to include a diverse set of program stakeholders. This sample is not meant to be representative, and no power calculations were conducted since the data are mostly qualitative.

The online survey will be sent to all 528 grant applicants for whom we have contact information. This will include active and terminated grantees, as well as unsuccessful grant applicants.

Deviations from Sample Design

The team originally planned to visit implementation sites of grantees; however, after arrival in the field, it was decided that additional key informant interviews with a greater number of grantees would yield more useful data for the purposes of this evaluation.

Response Rate

N/A

Weighting

N/A

Questionnaires

Overview

The evaluation made use of key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and an online survey. The data collection instruments included:

1. KII-MCA I staff: This included staff involved in the management, administration, or operations of GP
2. KII-MCA I contractors: Including PMC, GPM, GMT, and TOPE
3. KII-MCC: including all staff involved in GP or the requirements grantees needed to fulfill (SGIP, ESA)
4. KII-GOI: including Government of Indonesia employees involved in GP
5. KII-grantee
6. FGD-grantee
7. FGD-MCA I
8. Online survey-grantee: administered to all grant applicants, with skip logic for those that did not receive a grant, that received but did not complete their grant, and that completed a grant

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2017-10-30	2017-11-17	N/A
2017-12-05	2017-12-13	N/A

Data Collection Notes

Each interview team consisted of two or more interviewers, with a Bahasa-Indonesia speaker present at each interview. A total of five interviewers were used for data collection. Data collection took place in two rounds, from October 30-November 17 and December 5-13. The team conducted interviews in Jakarta, Bogor, Yogyakarta, Bali, Jambi, Lobmok, Makassar, and Mamuju. The team conducted focus groups in Jakarta and Bogor. Interviewing took place every day of the week. Interviews averaged 1-1.5 hour for all questionnaires - most all respondents were willing and available to talk for over an hour. Interviews were all conducted in English or Bahasa Indonesia, depending on the respondent's preferred language.

Questionnaires

The evaluation made use of key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and an online survey. The data collection instruments included:

1. KII-MCA I staff: This included staff involved in the management, administration, or operations of GP
2. KII-MCA I contractors: Including PMC, GPM, GMT, and TOPE
3. KII-MCC: including all staff involved in GP or the requirements grantees needed to fulfill (SGIP, ESA)
4. KII-GOI: including Government of Indonesia employees involved in GP
5. KII-grantee
6. FGD-grantee
7. FGD-MCA I
8. Online survey-grantee: administered to all grant applicants, with skip logic for those that did not receive a grant, that received but did not complete their grant, and that completed a grant

Supervision

The data collection team included five team members - Local Research Manager, Renewable Energy/Economics Expert, Agriculture/NRM Expert, Qualitative Methods Expert, and Local Research Assistant. The LRM, LRA, and Ag/NRM Expert were fluent in Bahasa Indonesia. The team divided into sub-teams for interviews, and alternated responsibility for conducting the interview and note-taking. All sub-teams had at least one Bahasa Indonesia speaker.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Interview notes were cleaned at the end of each day of data collection, and aggregated at the end of each week in the evaluation team's data management system. All data editing was conducted manually based on virtual exchanges between team members to clarify inconsistencies between notes. The team conducted team analysis sessions once per week to help identify emerging themes, trends, and/or findings. After the team completed data collection, cleaned interview notes uploaded to Dedoose for coding.

Other Processing

All data was noted manually in a notebook or on a laptop during data collection. During fieldwork, interviewers would review notes to ensure accuracy. Computer typed notes were then shared with other interviewers, reviewed, and saved on the team's data management system. The evaluation specialist then used these notes to enter into the coding software used. A total of five team members typed notes and reviewed notes. One team member was responsible for coding, following a codebook and hierarchy developed by the Qualitative Methods Expert and Ag/NRM Expert.

Data Appraisal

Estimates of Sampling Error

N/A